Increasingly something of what must have been the real character of the Asylum emerges "between the lines" of otherwise laudatory reports. These often appear in the form of contrasts the negativity of which is overlooked for some other point which Workman wishes to make, or as observations which accidentally suggest a context besides the one they were meant to describe.

Thus in the Report for 1869, indicating an almost incredible thoroughness, Langmuir claims that he "saw every patient in the Asylum, and entered into conversation with many of them" (1869, 3). Except for an unspecified number of exceptions, mainly women, the patients are generally "quiet and tranquil" (3). For some reason a number of patients are noticeably happier than they were for his last visit. Approving the "personal cleanliness" of the inmates, he nevertheless regrets their "prison like" attire. He observes that in the "orderly wards" meals are served in orderly fashion, but still expresses his offense at some particularly glaring examples of "disorderly" behaviour, and his general impression that "a better classification" would be "very desirable" (1869, 3). Passing through the wards "at night after the inmates [have] retired" (1869, 4), Langmuir appreciates the "good" ventilation (1869, 4) of all but one of the wards.

Throughout the rest of the same Report, Workman glances at "the reports of the English Commissioners in lunacy" (1869, 14). He seems especially, and perhaps rather defensively, irritated by an idealism which he now considers to be arbitrary, inadequately empirical, uncompromisingly deductive. Their uncompromising principles have more to do with past practices, than practices intended to improve the conditions of patients. While admitting that "no less than 12 in our 26 deaths this year have resulted from pulmonary consumption, of which only 3 were of the manifest, whilst 9 were of the latent form" (1869, 13), he defends himself against the criticism of an unnamed English writer, that "our hygienic condition must be bad in order to produce so high a proportion of deaths from consumption" (13). He angrily asserts that if English post mortem research were as thorough as his, "their proportion will not be found less than ours" (13). He observes that, since the average English mortality rate is twice his, it would be very surprising if a large proportion of those deaths were not due to consumption as well as general paresis, at least among women. From January 1, 1865 till the time of writing (October, 1869) the death rate from consumption has been 15 men and 34 women out of a total of 121, or about 40%. Finally, rather than speculate, he urges his English reader to